

United States Patent and Trademark Office



DATE MAILED: 04/02/2003

FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/113,446 07/10/1998 **GREGG WAGNER** 003470.P005 8055 7590 04/02/2003 **BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN** EXAMINER 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR ANDERSON, GERALD A LOS ANGELES, CA 90025 **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER 3637

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_2
	09/113,446	WAGNER ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JERRY A ANDERSON	3637	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX-(6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication: - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	. 136(a). In no event, however, may a reput thin the statutory minimum of thirty d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTI tite, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. 4S from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	Cohruna 2002		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20			
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice unde			
Disposition of Claims	•		
4) \boxtimes Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application	on.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are withdraw	n from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>6-11</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir		_	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	•		
Applicant may not request that any objection to		. ,	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		sapproved by the Examiner.	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in r 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	• •		
•	-xammer.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	an missibu undar 25 H.C.C. S	110(a) (d) as (5)	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. 9	119(a)-(d) or (t).	
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	, ata bawa baan ragaiyad		
1. Certified copies of the priority document		nlication No.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docume	·	·	
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the principle application from the International E See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	-	
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(e) (to a provisional application).	
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language p 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome 	• •		
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	5) Notice of In	ummary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/113,446

Art Unit: 3637

DETAILED ACTION

The Decision of the Board of Appeals has been considered. The suggestion by the Board that the Examiner consider the patentability of the applicant's claims under 35 USC 103 in view of Schmidt has been accessed with the following action. Additionally, art has come to the Examiner's attention and is applied as follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 6-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schmidt et al as applied to claims above, and further in view of Shepard et al and Pitel. Schmidt is cited showing a housing 1 having a hollow body portion 2 including a handle portion 9B having a battery compartment 32, an enclosure portion 9A and a

Art Unit: 3637

scanner face 9G, 12 with a tongue connecting to a grooved enclosure aperture and an end cap 9F. Schmidt fails to show the body portion as a **ne-pi c**, hollow body portion. a tongue with a T-shaped cross section or a gasket. Shepard is cited showing a housing having a handle portion 12 and a body portion 14 that is molded as one-piece from plastic material for the purpose providing a lightweight housing. Pitel is cited showing plastic parts having a T-shaped tongue and groove connection for the purpose of securing the parts. Chadima, Jr. et al is cited showing a hand-held housing with parts 41 and 42 connected by tongue and groove having a gasket 100 for the purpose of sealing the connection. Since the references are from the same field of endeavor the purpose of Shepard and Pitel would have been obvious in the pertinent art of Schmidt at the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one having an ordinary skill in the art to have modified Schmidt with a housing molded as one-piece from plastic material for the purpose providing a light-weight housing in view of Shepard, with parts having a Tshaped tongue and groove connection for the purpose of securing the parts a in view of Pitel and with parts connected by tongue and groove having a gasket for the purpose of sealing the connection in view of Pitel.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jerry Anderson whose telephone number is 703 038 2202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on 703 308 24668. The fax phone numbers for

Application/Control Number: 09/113,446

Art Unit: 3637

Page 4

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305 3597 for regular communications and 703 306 4195 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308 2197.

Jaa March 26, 2003

ERALD A. ANDERSON